DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 072 CS 504 495

AUTHOR Neer, Michael R.; Hudson, David D.
TITLE The Gender Communication Scale: A Scale Development of an Instrument to Measure Gender Role Behavior.
PUB DATE Feb 83
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Albuquerque, NM, February 19-22, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; Communication Research; Females; Friendship; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; Males; *Measurement Techniques; *Role Perception; Sex Differences; *Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; *Social Behavior; Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Gender Communication Scale

ABSTRACT

To derive a descriptive profile of communication role patterns and to determine whether these patterns were gender dependent, a Gender Communication Scale was developed by selecting scale items from other instruments that best discriminated reports of role behavior. The scale was then administered to 91 male and 148 female undergraduate students. Four dimensions of role behavior were tested: role dominance, role sensitivity, role adaptability, and role flexibility. Also tested were sex role attitudes. Findings showed that biological sex was a less consistent predictor of role communication patterns than role variability. Role variability appeared to better explain development of opposite-sex friendship than biological sex. On the other hand, biological sex did appear to mediate social-role attitudes more consistently than role variability. It was concluded that the global gender stereotype frequently attributed to males and females was not consistently manifested in perceptions of communication role behavior. (A copy of the scale and tables of data are appended.) (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED238072

THE GENDER COMMUNICATION SCALE: A SCALE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT TO MEASURE GENDER ROLE BEHAVIOR

Michael R. Neer
David D. Hudson

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael R. Neer
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to develop and test an instrument for measuring gender role communication patterns. Results demonstrated that the instrument (GCS) reliabily measures perception of role variability.

The findings indicated that males and females whose role communication pattern was characterized by perceptual variability were generally more expressive, sensitive, flexible, and adaptive than individuals who did not perceive their role communication patterns as being variable.

The study concludes by suggesting that role variability is a more stable predictor of communication role behavior than communicator sex.

Michael R. Neer is Assistant Professor of Communication Studies, University of Missouri-Kansas City and David D. Hudson is Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Hawaii at Manoa. This paper is based on results reported at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Albuquerque, February, 1983.

CS 504495

THE GENDER COMMUNICATION SCALE: A SCALE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT TO MEASURE GENDER ROLE BEHAVIOR

The questions of how a man should act and how a woman should act are clearly related to role behavior and communication. Until recently, however, answers to these questions were fixed and inflexible. Women were dependent, passive, fragile, sensitive, and emotional while men were independent, aggressive, competitive, confident, and controlled. The fact that not everyone "fit" into the correct mold was unimportant. Females were "feminine" and males were "masculine." If either deviated by breaking the "rules" governing the roles, then she was regarded as aggressive and "man-ish" and he was regarded as passive and "effeminant."

Changes are taking place as answers to these questions change. Women are now rejecting traditional roles and expectations determined solely on the basis of sex. Expected patterns of behavior also are being altered. Women are behaving more assertively, pursuing careers, and choosing not to take primary responsibility alone for domestic affairs. Indeed, more and more individuals are willing to see themselves and others as possessing an androgynous mixture of traits that were once considered

"privileged" female and male behaviors.

Nonetheless, it is inaccurate to conclude that the simplified stereotypes of femininity and masculinity no longer describe the characteristics of men and women. Judith M. Bardwick in her book, The Psychology of Women, notes that while individuals may deviate from these unidimensional role behaviors, group differences between the sexes still support traditional role stereotypes.[1] Numerous research studies provide support for Bardwick's contention. For example, research by Broverman and others demonstrated that a strong consensus exists about the differing characteristics of men and women across groups differing in age and education. [2] Women were consistently seen as less competent, less independent, and less logical than males while men were seen as less sensitive, less warm, and less expressive than females. Furthermore, the characteristics identified with masculinity generally were more positively valued than the characteristics identified with femininity. Most importantly, however, Brovermen notes that males and females define themselves through the expected stereotypes.

Research in speech communication also provides support for the existence of gender stereotypes. For example, Rosenfeld and Fowler found that personality variables which characterized female democratic leaders included being open-minded, helpful, affectionate and nurturing, accepting of blame, and desirous of group stability and unity. Male democratic leaders, on the other hand, were characterized as being mature, forceful, having superior intellectual ability, being analytic of self and others, and being utilitarian. [3] These same researchers also observed

that the communication behavior of male and female democratic leaders was similar to those of democratic "task" leaders and democratic "socio-emotional" leaders. In this and other studies, women were found to express more friendly acts and agreement than male democratic leaders while men were found to express more disagreement, perform more unfriendly acts, and offer more suggestions than females. [4]

However, research is far from clear in confirming global gender differences. For instance, in some studies females have been found to be more disclosing than males [5] while other studies show neither males nor females differ in their rate of disclosure. [6] Studies in organizational leadership also have failed to consistently yield significant differences between male and female leaders and subordinate satisfaction with their leaders. [7] Other researchers have further concluded that "what is noticeable is how few expected differences have been firmly substantiated by empirical studies of actual speech. [8] As Hass points out, gender differences represent only statistical differences often mediated by variables other than sex. [9]

Furthermore, sex has typically been treated as a dichotomous, biologically-based variable in social psychological and communication research. However, research by Bem has demonstrated that sex-type alone may not adequately differentiate female from male behavior. Indeed, Bem suggests that behavior among males and females may better be distinguished as a function of an individual's psychological sex-role orientation (as measured by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory — BSRI). [10]

According to Bem, androgynous individuals (i.e., those

individual's whose self-concepts and social behaviors includes both "masculine" and "feminine" traits) demonstrate greater behavioral flexibility than individual's who type-cast themselves as either male or female. [11] Bem also has shown that highly androgynous individuals often have higher self-esteem than individuals whose behavior is characteristically sex-typed. Androgynous individuals have also been found to engage in more self-disclosure and demonstrate greater responsiveness or affection toward play objects. [12]

However, the BSRI has been sharpley criticized on both conceptual and methodological grounds. The foremost conceptual criticism involves assigning a masculine value to some traits and a feminine value to other traits used for interpreting BSRI scores (e.g., "assertive" is assigned a masculine value and "tender" is assigned a feminine value). [13] Locksley and Colten further state that assigning such values to traits is based, at least in part, on the premise "that sex-type is a function of behavior or attributes significantly more characteristic of one sex than the other." [14]

Methodological criticisms of the BSRI typically fault the use of median splits of summed scores derived solely from empirical studies (rather than a priori operational definitions of the androgyny construct). [15] This appears a valid criticism when the BSRI is factor analyzed. Pedhazer and Tetenbaum report that the factor structure of the feminine traits breaks down into two separate factors; one consisting of positive traits and the other consisting of negative traits. [16] Thus, rating

of feminine traits may be confounded by the social desirability of the items rather than representing a unidimensional scale measurement of androgyny.

In our opinion, there is a lack of certainty about the definitions of masculinity and femininity. Therefore, rather than testing scales which attempt to define these constructs, a series of items were developed to measure the communication role patterns of individuals regardless of their sex. Thus, the primary objective of this study was to derive a descriptive profile of communication role patterns and to determine whether these patterns were gender dependent.

Three research questions were developed for this study. The questions were formulated on the assumption that role behavior might function as a better indicator of gender communication patterns than androgyny scales which place items within either a feminine or masculine domain. Thus, in this study items were not assigned masculine or feminine values. This method of developing scale items was selected since it does not assume a stereotypic sex-typed behavior or underlying personality traits as factors dichotomizing behavior between the sexes.

QUESTION #1: Will GCS scores (overall role variability) better discriminate an individual's communication patterns than the sex of the individual?

QUESTION #2: Will GCS scores better predict social attitudes toward women's roles than sex differences?

QUESTION #3: Will individual's with higher GCS scores have developed closer personal relationships with members of the opposite

sex than individuals with lower GCS scores?

METHOD

The sample consisted of 91 male and 148 female undergraduates enrolled in the upper-divisional interpersonal communication course at the University of Hawaii during the Spring semester, 1982. Subjects were administered the Gender Communication Scale (GCS) as part of a series of interpersonal inventories completed in the course.

The GCS was developed by selecting scale items that best discriminated reports of role behavior from administration of another instrument previously tested. [17] Each administration of the original instrument consisted of 30 Likert-type scales anchored from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." A total of 65 scales were tested with the least discriminating eliminated after each trial. The GCS therefore consisted of 25 of the original scales and three additional scales directed toward gender-specific role communication patterns.

Role behavior was defined "as those characteristics of one or more persons in context." [18] More specifically, role behavior was defined as the recurrent communication patterns that characterize an individual while occupying various contexts of social interaction.

Four dimensions of role behavior were tested. These were: (1) role dominance - D, (2) role sensitivity - S, (3) role adaptability - A, and (4) role flexibility - F. Role

dominance was defined as those behaviors that place an individual in the focus of interaction while role sensitivity was defined as interaction aimed at nurtuting an interpersonal relationship. The adaptability and flexibility dimensions were measures of generalized self-perceptions of role performance. Role adaptability was defined as the ability to adjust communication to the needs of others and the ability to perform role behaviors without difficulty. Role flexibility was operationalized as the ability to switch roles and perform multiple roles when interacting with others.

The dominance and sensitivity dimensions were selected since males and females have been found to differ in their preferences for these role behaviors. [19] Role adaptability and role flexibility were selected since theoretical discussions of role behavior typically include these dimensions as central to role theory. [20] A copy of all 28 scales appears in the appendix of this paper.

Fourteen additional Likert-type scales were also tested. These items were designed as measures of sex-role attitudes. Half of the items tested whether males and females differed in their attitudes concerning the social-role position of women (e.g., "A career and motherhood do not mix," "Men are better leaders than women," and "A woman makes a better grade school teacher than a man."). The other half of the items tested whether males and females had differing attitudes concerning gender communication patterns (e.g., "Women are easier to talk with than men" and "Women express their feelings better than men"). A final self-report measure requested subjects to

estimate the number of friends (i.e., platonic and non-sexual) they had with members of the opposite sex. Subjects were provided a six-point scale ranging from zero to five or more close friends. Opposite-sex friendships was selected as a validity check since the authors believed that role variability (i.e., subjects who characterized their role behavior as representive of all four role dimensions) would be reflected, in part, through the selection of a wide variety of friendships in which the sex of the friend should not be a primary factor in determining the nature of the relationship.

Analysis of the data included correlation and associated statistics (e.g., factor analysis and discriminant analysis) for assessing the reliability of the GCS. Factor analysis included principle components with varimax rotation and an initial eigenvalue cut-off criterion set at 1.00 for the extraction of factors. A four-factor solution was selected to match the number of dimensions of the GCS. Factors were required to load one or more items above .60. Remaining items were required to load at or above .40 before being added the item-composite of each factor.

The relationship between communication role behavior and social-role attitudes was tested with discriminant analysis and analysis of variance. These procedures were used by assigning the summed GCS scores to one of three groups (i.e., low, medium, or high role variability). The groups were determined on the basis of deviations from the GCS grand mean. Finally, chi-square was selected as a test of significance for estimation of the number of close friends with members of the

opposite sex. The median split was employed for the purpose of treating the data as dichotomous categories (i.e., "some friends" vs. " many friends").

RESULTS

The GCS yielded a grand mean and standard deviation capable of distinguishing ranges or levels of role variability (descriptive statistics are reported in Table 1).

Factor analysis resulted in a four-factor solution (see Table 2). Three of the four factors each loaded one or more items above .60. Factor 1 loaded nine of the ten role dominance items. Factor 2 loaded four adaptability items and one flexibility item while factor 3 loaded four of the six role sensitivity items. Factor 4 loaded two flexibility items and one adaptability item. Thus, factors 1 and 3 were more homogeneous factors than 2 and 4. Item analysis of the GCS indicated that one-quarter of the items correlated above .50 with the overall scale while another quarter correlated above .40. All but three of the remaining scales (i.e., items 19, 21, and 26) correlated above .30. Coefficient alpha of .80 (alpha = .82 when items 19, 21, and 26 were deleted and .85 when only the twenty-one factored items were tested) indicates that the GCS is a fairly reliable measure of role variability. Results also indicated that each of the four dimensions moderately to highly correlated with the overall GCS scale (see Table 3).

Discriminant analysis further indicates that the range levels assigned to the summed GCS scores yield a reliable index

of role variability. Univariate F-ratios were all significant at the .001 level for all but two of the items (i.e., items 19 and 21). Seventeen of the items loaded on the discriminant function which correctly classified 88% of the subjects within their respective range of role behavior membership group (see Table 4).

Remaining tests were designed to determine whether the GCS would function as a better discriminator of role variability and social-role attitudes than communicator sex. Eleven of the 28 GCS items yielded significant t-values for sex. Males scored higher on five of ten dominance items (i.e., group leader, persuader, supervisor, initiator, and interaction-manager) while females scored higher means on three of the six role sensitivity items (i.e., counselor, reinforcer, and empathizer). Females also described their role behavior as more flexible and adaptable on three of twelve items. That is, females stated that they communicated on the basis of both the situation and the sex of the person with whom they interacted (see items 19, 21 and 24). Table 5 reports gender differences for each of the four dimensions and the overall GCS score.

Discriminant analysis for sex resulted in one significant function which correctly classified 60% of the subjects on the basis of their sex. Six items loaded on the function (see items 4, 6, 19, 21, 22, and 24). These results generally confirm those findings derived through t-tests (see Table 6).

Interaction of sex X GCS could not be determined with the original range levels since sample sizes of less than twenty were observed for three of six cells. Thus, GCS scores were

dichotomized at the median split so that interaction effects could be determined. Significance was observed with 25 of 28 items. These results consistently demonstrated that females who characterized their role behavior as highly variable perceived themselves as being able to perform dominating roles as easily as males and more easily than either males or females who did not perceive their role behavior as highly variable.

On the other hand, males who characterized their role behavior as highly variable also rated themselves as better able to perform sensitivity roles than both females and males who did not rate their role behavior as highly variable. Mean differences ranged from .50 to 1.20. Since these findings would prove too volumnous to report for all 25 scales, results will only be reported for overall GCS scores (see Table 7).

Results for social-role attitudes indicated that gender differences were significant with nine of the 14 items. Specifically, females were less accepting of the male-bias inherent in several of the items (e.g., "A career and motherhood do not mix," "Men are better leaders than women," "I would prefer my family doctor be a male rather than a female," and "I would prefer my job supervisor be a male rather than a female.").

On the other hand, females did agree that certain role behaviors were gender-dependent (e.g., "A woman makes a better grade school teacher than a man" and "Men and women have different roles they should be expected to perform."). Mean scores and t-values were generally lower with these items than those reported for role variability. Interaction of

Sex X GCS also yielded results similar to main effects. However, one item (i.e., "Women are easier to talk with than men") did yield results partially consistent with those expected. That is, females with high GCS scores did not feel that women were easier to talk to than those women scoring lower on the GCS.

Discriminant analysis for gender yielded one significant function for social-role attitudes which correctly classified 75% of the subjects according to their sex (see Table 8). However, only three items loaded above .30 on the function (see items 32, 33, and 38). Discriminant analysis of range of role behavior failed to yield a significant discriminant function although the analysis of Sex X GCS yielded one significant function which loaded the same three items but only classified 46% of the subjects within their appropriate membership group (see Table 9).

The final research question that individuals whose role behavior was characterized by high variability would form closer opposite-sex friendships was confirmed. That is, both males and females with high GCS scores estimated they had developed closer friendships than either males or females with low GCS scores (see Table 10).

CONCLUSIONS

Findings in this study were partially consistent with the research questions tested. That is, biological sex is a less

consistent predictor of role communication patterns than role variability. Role variability also appears to better explain development of opposite-sex friendships than biological sex. On the other hand, biological sex does appears to mediate social-role attitudes more consistently than role variability.

These latter findings also may hold intrapersonal as well as interpersonal importance. Previous research has reported that females have lower self-esteem than males and that females more often conform to social expectations. For instance, longitudinal research by Blocke suggests that females exhibit less curiosity and exploratory behavior than males and females are more anxious and concerned about fitting in with social expectations. [21]

However, results reported here suggest that females are freeing themselves of socially-expected behaviors, as evidenced in several gender differences regarding the appropriateness of social-role behaviors. While these same findings confirm the "male stereotype," other findings in this study indicate that men are also freeing themselves of the belief that nurturing is a woman's activity. Thus, in light of the conflicting findings reported in this study and findings of previous research, we may conclude that the global gender stereotype frequently attributed to males and females is not consistently manisfested in perceptions of communication role behavior.

Additional refinements in measurement may lend increased credibility to these conclusions. The GCS next be submitted to validity checks more stringent than the self-reported estimation of opposite-sex friendships used in this study.

The GCS should be compared with several measures of actual communication, such as language style and role patterns evident within leadership emergent groups, as well as being correlated and factored against the BSRI.

Other lines of research also should be incorporated as measures of validity. Hass,[22] Baird[23] and Foss and Foss[24] in their summaries of gender research, have noted sex differences in topics of discussion, nonverbal interaction, and language content. Although the research does not consistently support sex differences, a reexamination of these findings with the GCS may perhaps support fewer sex differences than those originally reported.

Should the GCS disconfirm previously derived findings in gender research, additional theoretical support for the importance of role behavior in defining the communication competence construct should be evident. That is, role behavior may provide an organizing function for a communication competence construct if it is assumed that other constructs central to communication competence, such as decentering and empathic ability, are learned through the enactment of role behaviors.

Since communication requires the enactment of various roles in many different situations, the GCS must also concentrate on testing other role behaviors. Should additional roles correlate with the GCS, a more representative range of role behaviors may be added to the scale. Preliminary results with the GCS appear promising as both a measure of communication role orientation and as a method of developing a descriptive profile of role variability.

The GCS already has demonstrated practical usefulness in the

classroom. The GCS is well-suited to the interpersonal course where students may discuss the effects of gender on communication style. Providing students with their GCS scores has stimulated class discussion of the influence of gender on communication. More specifically, class discussions have frequently centered on the traditional ways in which males and females relate to one another and has challenged several students to question whether their communicative behavior should be considered gender-dependent.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Judith M. Bardwick, The Psychology of Women (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

[2] Inge K. Broverman, Susan R. Vogel, Donald M. Broverman, Frank E. Clarkson, and Paul S. Rosenkrants, "Sex-Role Stereotypes: A current Appraisal," Journal of Social Issues, 28 (1972), 59-78.

[3] Lawrence B. Rosenfeld and Gene D. Fowler, "Personality, Sex, and Leadership Style," Communication Monographs, 43 (1976), 320-324.

[4] Results of this study were reported in Ronald B. Adler, Lawrence B. Rosenfeld, and Neil Towne, Interplay: The Process of Interpersonal Communication (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980), 91; Other studies, too numerous to review here have found similar results. See for example: W. Carrigan and J. Julian, "Sex and Birth-Order Differences in Conformity as a Function of Need Affiliation Arousal," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3 (1966), 479-483 and B. W. Eakins and R. G. Eakins, Sex Differences in Human Communication (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1978).

[5] See for example: W. Rivenbark, "Self-Disclosure Patterns Among Adolescents," Psychological Reports, 28 (1971), 35-42.

[6] See for example: B. Certner, "Exchange of Self-Disclosure in Same-Sexed Groups of Strangers," Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 40 (1973), 292-297.

[7] A synthesis of these findings may be found in K. J. Gritzmacher and T. M. Harrison, "Language and Female-Male Communication: Implications for Organizations," paper presented to the Speech Communication Association Convention, Anaheim, 1981.

[8] C. Kramer, B. Thorne, and N. Henley, "Perspectives of Language and Communication, Signs, 3 (1978), 638-651.

[9] A. Hass, "Male and Female Spoken Language Differences: Stereotypes and Evidence," Psychological Reports, 86 (1979), 616-626.

[10] See for example: S. J. Bem, "Sex-Role Adaptability: One Consequence of Androgyny," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31 (1975), 634-643.

[11] Bem

[12] Bem

[13]A. Locksley and M.E. Colten, "Psychological Androgyny: A Case of Mistaken Identity," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37 (1979), 1017-1031.

[14]Locksley and Colten

[15]E.J. Pedhazer and T.J. Tetenbaum, "Bem Sex-Role Inventory: A Theoretical and Methodological Critique," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37 (1979), 996-1016.

[16]Pedhazer and Tetenbaum

[17]_____and _____, "Role Behavior of the Apprehensive Communicator: A Preliminary Scale Development," Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association annual meeting, Anaheim, 1981.

[18]B.J. Biddle, Role Theory: Expectations, Identities, and Behaviors (New York: Academic Press, 1979), 58.

[19]Broverman and others

[20]See for example, Biddle

[21]"The Pinks and the Blues," NOVA, Interview with J. Blocke, University of California at Berkeley, PBS, 31 March 1981 (KHET-TV, Channel 11, Honolulu, Hawaii).

[22]Hass

[23]J.E. Baird, "Sex Differences in Group Communication: A Review of Relevant Research," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62 (1976), 179-192.

[24]K.A. Foss and S.K. Foss, "The Status of Research on Women and Communication," Communication Quarterly, 31 (Summmer 1983), 195-204.

ROLE COMMUNICATION INDEX

This survey includes some statements concerning attitudes and preferences you may have regarding the roles you perform when you interact with others.

A role may be defined as "one's pattern or style of communication when interacting with others." That is, a role describes how one communicates or behaves with others in various situations.

Please read the following statements and describe how they relate to you personally in your communication with others. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to any of these statements. Work quickly and record how each statement generally describes your communication with others

Please use the following scale in rating how each of the statements on this survey apply to you:

1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Uncertain 4=Disagree 5=Stongly Disagree

ROLE PERFORMANCE: The first series of questions concern the roles you perform when you communicate with others.

1. I enjoy assuming the role of leader during a small group discussion. (E)

2. In a small group setting I often find myself performing the role of encourager, or someone who tries to help others open up and participate in the discussion. (S)

3. In a social setting I often find myself performing the role of counselor, or someone who gives helpful advice to others or helps others solve their personal problems. (S)

4. I enjoy performing the role of host at a social gathering or special occasion. (E)

5. In a small group I often find myself performing the role of coordinator, or someone who tries to pull ideas and information together or tries to organize the activities of the group. (E)

6. In a social setting I often find myself in the role of persuader, or someone who likes to convince others to accept a particular point of view. (E)

7. I would enjoy assuming the role of supervisor when working with a group of people in a job situation. (E)

8. In a small group situation I often perform the role of initiator or someone who offers new ideas or suggests solutions. (E)

9. In a social setting I often find myself performing the role interaction manager, or someone leads or directs conversation with others. (E)

10. I would enjoy assuming the role of a "public relations persons" or someone who would represent a school or an organization at a special occasion. (E)

11. In a small group I often find myself performing the role of information-seeker, or someone who seeks clarification of ideas and suggestions made by group members. (E)

12. In a social setting I often find myself in the role of reinforcer, or someone who praises others and communicates warmth and trust toward others. (S)

13. I would enjoy performing the role of officer of a student group or a social organization. (E)

14. In a social setting I often perform the role of supporter, or someone who helps others feel at ease or comfortable when communicating. (S)

15. In a small group I often find myself in the role of empathizer, or someone who is sensitive and tries to understand the needs of others in the group. (S)

16. In a social setting I often find myself in the role of confidant, or someone who others trust with their secrets or problems. (S)

ROLE PERCEPTION: The next series of statements concern your attitudes and feelings about the roles you perform when communicating with others.

17. I am flexible in substituting one role for another with whomever I am communicating. (F)

18. I feel comfortable in roles I am performing for the first time. (A)

19. I usually communicate the same way with others regardless of the situation. (F)

20. I feel my communication is composed of many roles rather than just a few roles. (F)

21. The sex of the person I am communicating with is as important as any other single factor (e.g. social background, ethnic background, etc.) in determining how I communicate with others. (A)

22. I can easily communicate with others regardless of the role I am performing or occupying. (A)

23. I often have difficulty knowing how to communicate in certain roles. (A)

24. I generally communicate the same way with males as I do with females. (F)

25. I generally feel comfortable in whatever role I am performing. (A)

26. I perform more roles with members of my own sex than I do with members of the opposite sex. (F)

27. I prefer performing as few roles as possible. (F)

28. I am satisfied with the roles I perform in my communication with others. (A)

ROLE DIFFERENCES: The last series of statements concern your attitudes and feelings about role communication differences between males and females.

29. A career and motherhood do not mix.

30. Women are easire to talk with than men.

31. I approve of the new roles that women are performing in busines business and the professions.

32. Women express their feelings and emotions better than man.

33. Men are better leaders than women.

34. If a woman wants to make it in the business world, she has to think and act like a man.

35. A woman makes a better grade school teacher than a man.

36. Men should express their feelings and emotions as openly as women.

37. Women are easier to persuade than men.

38. I would prefer my family doctor to be a male than a female.

39.. Woman should be less aggressive than men.

40. I would prefer my job supervisor be a man rather than a woman.

41. Women do not need to communicate any differently than men.

42. Both men and women have separate (and different) roles they should be expected to perform.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

for the GCS

Mean	95.98	
Median	96.00	
Standard Deviation	9.89	
Range	63	(59 through 122)
Range Levels:		
Low	59-85	(n=30)
Moderate	86-106	(n=177)
High	107-122	(n=32)

Table 2

Factor Analysis

of the GCS

GCS Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
1	.67	.29	-.03	-.09
2	.44	.13	.26	.08
3	.19	.10	.38	-.14
4	.25	.23	.23	-.15
5	.61	.01	.02	-.02
6	.46	.09	-.16	-.05
7	.52	.07	-.13	-.24
8	.51	.25	.17	.09
9	.51	.22	.22	.06
10	.55	.14	.08	.03
11	.35	-.06	.19	.14
12	.04	.22	.55	.04
13	.53	-.06	.18	-.11
14	.08	.11	.69	.12
15	-.04	-.01	.64	.08
16	.15	.16	.51	-.22
17	.01	.56	.20	-.20
18	.08	.45	.02	.11
19	-.10	-.04	.04	-.36
20	.18	.28	.04	-.48
21	-.13	.06	-.06	.55
22	.18	.60	.16	.28
23	.07	.31	.18	.18
24	-.00	.26	.17	.46
25	.16	.62	.14	.12
26	.03	.15	-.05	.01
27	.03	.23	.07	-.08
28	.00	.51	.14	-.05
Eigenvalue	4.36	1.98	1.24	1.09
% of Variance	50.20	22.80	14.40	12.60

Table 3

Correlations Among GCS Dimensions

	D	S	F	A	GCS
D	1.00	.35*	.17**	.23*	.78*
S		1.00	.27*	.31*	.68*
F			1.00	.32*	.55*
A				1.00	.64*
GCS					1.00

*p .001

**p .004

KEY:

D = Dominance
S = Sensitivity
F = Flexibility
A = Adaptability
GCS = Gender Communication Scale

Table 4

Discriminant Analysis

for Range of Role Behavior

Eigenvalue	%Variance	Rc	Wilk's Lambda	X^2	df
2.32	95.35	.836	.269	294.45	48

p = .001

Table 5

Gender Differences

for GCS Dimensions

Variable	Group Means		t-value
	Male	Female	
Dominance	35.74	34.04	2.37*
Sensitivity	22.34	23.04	-1.74***
Flexibility	19.93	20.60	-1.94**
Adaptability	18.07	18.22	-.33
Overall GCS	96.09	96.91	.14

*p = .02

**p = .05

***p = .08

Table 6

Discriminant Analysis for Gender on Role Variability

Eigenvalue	%Variance	Rc	Wilk's Lambda	X^2	DF
.273	100.00	.463	.785	53.90	28

p = .002

Table 7

Analysis of Variance for Sex x GCS on Overall Role Variability

SOURCE	df	SS	MS	F-ratio*
Sex x GCS	3	14850.81	4950.26	137.78

Submeans:

Male x Low Variability(n=40) = 88.17
Male x High Variability(n=51) = 102.31
Female x Low Variability(n=69) = 86.95
Female x High Variability(n=79) = 103.73

*p = .001 (Scheffe-method: MH and FH < ML and FL)

Table 8

Discriminant Analysis for Gender with Social-role Attitudes

Eigenvalue	%Variance	Rc	Wilk's Lambda	X^2	DF
.552	100.00	.596	.643	101.24	14

p = .001

Table 9

Discriminant Analysis for Sex-role Variability with Social-role Attitudes

Eigenvalue	%Variance	Rc	Wilk's Lambda	X^2	DF
.559	86.16	.598	.587	121.65	42

p = .001

Table 10

Effects of Role Variability

on Opposite Sex Friendships

SOURCE	N	ESTIMATION OF FRIENDSHIPS	
		"Some"	"Many"
Male x Low	40	45%	55%
Male x High	51	24%	76%
Female x Low	69	58%	42%
Female x High	79	28%	72%

X^2 20.37 with 3 df (p= .001)